

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, as presently amended and in light of the following remarks, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-7 were originally filed in this application. By this Amendment, the applicant amends claims 1, 3 and 6, cancels claims 2, 4 and 5, and leaves claims 7 unamended. Thus, four claims remain in this application for reconsideration.

In the outstanding Office Action of September 13, 2005, all claims 1-7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) for obviousness over U.S. Patent No. 5,132,662 of Burch in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,465,915 of Kerdjoudj et al.

Initially, the applicant wants to thank Examiner Lau for the telephonic interview conducted with the undersigned attorney on October 21, 2005.

In order to overcome the above-mentioned rejection, dependent claims 2, 4 and 5 have been canceled and the subject matter thereof has been placed into the body of independent claim 1.

Claim 2 recites that the L-shaped bracket has closed-end elongated slots 152, as seen in Figs. 6-8. The primary prior art reference of Burch has open-ended elongated slots (unnumbered in Fig. 4) while Kerdjoudj et al. has circular holes 68 shown in Fig. 1.

Furthermore, no motivation can be gleaned from the secondary reference of Kerdjoudj et al. to close the ends of the elongated slots of the primary reference of Burch. In fact, closing the ends of the slots of Burch would destroy Burch's teaching that the slots should remain open in order to facilitate sliding of the L-shaped bracket 58 away from the fasteners (unnumbered in Fig. 4).

The subject matter of dependent claims 4 and 5 has been inserted into claim 1 to provide a basis for adding the recitation that the output shaft 153 of Fig. 6 extends through the bore 82 of Fig. 8 and further that a center line L through the bore 82 is parallel to the

plane of the second leg 86 of the L-shaped bracket. Support for this recitation is seen in Fig. 8 of the drawings and is found in paragraphs [32] through [34] on pages 9 and 10 of the specification.


The structure discussed in the preceding paragraph is neither disclosed nor suggested by Kerdjoudj et al. In fact, to the contrary, in this secondary reference, the center line through the bore, through which the output shaft 60 extends, is perpendicular, instead of parallel, to the plane of the second leg 14 of the L-shaped bracket. See Fig. 2 of Kerdjoudj et al.

Therefore, the applicant takes the position that amended claim 1 is not obvious over Burch in view of Kerdjoudj et al. Thus, careful reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of the remaining claims 1, 3, 6 and 7 for obviousness are earnestly solicited.

Consequently, in view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, no further issues are believed to be outstanding and this application should be considered in clear condition for formal allowance. Therefore, a quick and favorable action to that effect is hereby requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Joseph A. Scafetta, Jr.
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 26,803

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)